



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,998	01/10/2002	Krishna Kishore Yellepeddy	AUS920010273US1	2727
7590	03/04/2005		EXAMINER NGUYEN, CINDY	
Robert H. Frantz P.O. Box 23324 Oklahoma City, OK 73123			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/044,998	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YELLEPEDDY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Cindy Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/10/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This is in response to application filed on 01/10/2002 in which claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed on 01/10/02 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Because it has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

### ***Specification***

#### **Content of Specification**

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.

Or alternatively, Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix": See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.

- (e) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:
  - (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."
  - (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."
- (f) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.
- (g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.
- (h) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly

Art Unit: 2161

complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.

- (i) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet or electronic page (37 CFR 1.52(b)(3)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).
- (j) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).
- (k) Sequence Listing. See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

There is no head of brief summary of the invention. Correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 6, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 6, 12 and 18 contain subject matter "blocking propagation" which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft windows 2000 server "Microsoft Metadirectory services concepts and architecture" (Microsoft) provided by Applicant in view of Shih et al. (US 6615223) (Shih).

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 13 Microsoft discloses: a method, a computer readable medium and a system for synchronization and propagation of metadirectory updates, said metadirectory comprising a plurality of joined heterogeneous data sources, said data sources comprising one or more entries having one or more attributes, said method comprising the steps of:

selecting a best match entry of said metadirectory to said first entry in the first data source (page 18 to page 19, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, Microsoft); and propagating a differential update command to at least one other joined data source to implement said first update operation (page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, Microsoft). However, Microsoft is silent to disclose: receiving a first update operation for a first entry in a first data source. On the other hand, Shih discloses: receiving a first update operation for a first entry in a first data source (col. 10, lines 9-40, Shih). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the steps for receiving a first update operation for a first entry in a first data source in the system of Microsoft as taught by Shih. The motivation being to enable the system provided the LDAP data operation to update entry as adding, deleting, and modifying the data record in database system and using data operation to organize database.

Regarding claims 2, 8 and 14, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 above above, respectively. In addition, Microsoft/Shih discloses: wherein said step of receiving a first update operation comprises receiving an LDAP change operation.

Regarding claims 5, 11 and 17, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 above, respectively. In addition, Microsoft/Shih discloses: wherein said step of propagating a differential update

Art Unit: 2161

command comprises the step of transmitting an LDAP change operation (page 15, third paragraph, Microsoft).

Regarding claims 6, 12 and 18, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 above, respectively. In addition, Microsoft/Shih discloses: wherein said step of propagating a differential update command comprises the steps of: creating a copy of said metadirectory best match entry (col. 11, lines 3-8, Shih);

applying said first update operation to said copy of the best match entry to yield a modified best match entry;

comparing said best match entry to said modified best match entry to determine if said first update operation results in a net change to said best match entry (col. 14, lines 13-24, Shih); and

blocking propagation of said first update operation if no net change is determined to be caused by the first update operation (col. 9, lines 42-60, Shih).

Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft windows 2000 server "Microsoft Metadirectory services concepts and architecture" (Microsoft) in view of Shih et al. (US 6615223) (Shih) and further in view of Cappi (US 20020038308).



Regarding claims 3, 9 and 15, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 above, respectively. However, Microsoft/Shih didn't disclose: wherein said step of selecting a best match entry of said metadirectory comprises the step of consulting a synonym list to resolve multiple matches. On the other hand, Cappi discloses: wherein said step of selecting a best match entry of said metadirectory comprises the step of consulting a synonym list to resolve multiple matches (page 4, 0056, Cappi). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step of consulting a synonym list to resolve multiple matches in the combination system of Microsoft/Shih as taught by Shih. The motivation being to enable the system provided a dictionary with employed by a user when conducting a search or otherwise retrieving data base on the weights of keyword dictionary (page 4, 0053-0057, Cappi).

Regarding claims 4, 10 and 16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 above, respectively. In addition, Microsoft/Shih/Cappi discloses: wherein said step of selecting a best match entry of said metadirectory comprises the step of performing a weighted scoring analysis across two or more attributes (page 4, 0057, Cappi).

#### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2161

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

*CN*

Cindy Nguyen

March 1, 2005

*Frantz Coby*  
**FRANTZCOBY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**